TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
Ph. 512-327-5515
Fax 512-327-5575

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

DATE: February 12, 2007

TO: Examiner CHAI, Longbit
USPTO GPAU 2131

FAX NO.: 571-273-8300

FROM: Jeffrey G. Toler
Reg. No.: 38,342

RE: U.S. App. No.: 10/623,274 filed July 18, 2003

Applicant(s): Brian Gonsalves, et al.

Atty. Dkt. No.: 1033-SS00378

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DETECTING COMPUTER PORT INACTIVITY

NO. OF PAGES (including Cover Sheet): 28

MESSAGE:

Attached please find:

☒ Transmittal Form (1 pg)
☒ Fee Transmittal [in duplicate] (2 pgs)
☒ Brief in Support of Appeal (24 pgs)

8500 Bluffstone Cove
Suite A201
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78759

Tel: (512) 327-5515
Fax: (512) 327-5575

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 12 2007

PTO/SB/21 (09-06)
Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission	28

Application Number	10/623,274
Filing Date	July 18, 2003
First Named Inventor	Brian Gonsalves, et al.
Art Unit	2131
Examiner Name	CHAI, Longbit
Attorney Docket Number	1033-SS00378

ENCLOSURES *(Check all that apply)*

- [x] Fee Transmittal Form
  - [ ] Fee Attached
- [ ] Amendment/Reply
  - [ ] After Final
  - [ ] Affidavits/declaration(s)
- [ ] Extension of Time Request
- [ ] Express Abandonment Request
- [ ] Information Disclosure Statement
- [ ] Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- [ ] Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
  - [ ] Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53
- [ ] Drawing(s)
- [ ] Licensing-related Papers
- [ ] Petition
- [ ] Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- [ ] Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- [ ] Terminal Disclaimer
- [ ] Request for Refund
- [ ] CD, Number of CD(s) _____
  - [ ] Landscape Table on CD
- [ ] After Allowance Communication to TC
- [ ] Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- [x] Appeal Communication to TC **(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)**
- [ ] Proprietary Information
- [ ] Status Letter
- [ ] Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

Remarks

Customer No.: 60533

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Toler Schaffer, LLP		
Signature			
Printed name	Jeffrey G. Toler		
Date	2-12-2007	Reg. No.	38,342

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Jeaneaux Jordan	Date	2-12-07

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 12 2007

PTO/SB/17 (07-06)
Approved for use through 01/31/2007. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number

Effective on 12/08/2004.
Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).

FEE TRANSMITTAL For FY 2006

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT ($) 500.00

Complete if Known	
Application Number	10/623,274
Filing Date	July 18, 2003
First Named Inventor	Brian Gonsalves, et al.
Examiner Name	CHAI, Longbit
Art Unit	2131
Attorney Docket No.	1033-SS00378

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

☐ Check ☐ Credit Card ☐ Money Order ☐ None ☐ Other (please identify): _____

☑ Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 50-2469 Deposit Account Name: TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

☑ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee

☑ Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 ☑ Credit any overpayments

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES

Application Type	FILING FEES Fee ($)	FILING FEES Small Entity Fee ($)	SEARCH FEES Fee ($)	SEARCH FEES Small Entity Fee ($)	EXAMINATION FEES Fee ($)	EXAMINATION FEES Small Entity Fee ($)	Fees Paid ($)
Utility	300	150	500	250	200	100	
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65	
Plant	200	100	300	150	160	80	
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300	
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0	

2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES

Fee Description	Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee ($)
Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)	50	25
Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)	200	100
Multiple dependent claims	360	180

Total Claims _____ - 20 or HP = _____ x Fee ($) _____ = Fee Paid ($) _____

HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20.

Indep. Claims _____ - 3 or HP = _____ x Fee ($) _____ = Fee Paid ($) _____

HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3.

Multiple Dependent Claims: Fee ($) _____ Fee Paid ($) _____

3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE

If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is $250 ($125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).

Total Sheets _____ - 100 = Extra Sheets _____ / 50 = Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof _____ (round up to a whole number) x Fee ($) _____ = Fee Paid ($) _____

4. OTHER FEE(S)

Non-English Specification, $130 fee (no small entity discount) Fees Paid ($) _____

Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): Brief in Support of Appeal 500.00

SUBMITTED BY

Signature		Registration No. (Attorney/Agent) 38,342	Telephone 512/327-5515
Name (Print/Type)	Jeffrey G. Toler		Date 2-12-2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 12 2007

Attorney Docket No.: 1033-SS00378

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s):	**Brian Gonsalves, et al.**		
Title:	**SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DETECTING COMPUTER PORT INACTIVITY**		
App. No.:	**10/623,274**	Filed:	**July 18, 2003**
Examiner:	**CHAI, Longbit**	Group Art Unit:	**2131**
Atty. Dkt. No.:	**1033-SS00378**	Confirmation No.:	**2414**

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF APPEAL

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Appellant
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, TX, 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)

02/14/2007 JBALINAN 00000048 502469 10623274
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

The Real Party in Interest in the present Appeal is **SBC Knowledge Ventures, L.P.**, the assignee, of patent application no. **10/623,274**, as evidenced by the assignment set forth at Reel **014202**, Frame **0682**.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal, Appellant is not aware of any such appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 30 claims pending in the application (claims 1-30).

B. Status of All the Claims

Claims 1, 10, 19, 23, and 26 are independent claims. According to paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of the Non-Final Office Action dated September 29, 2006 ("the September 29 Office Action"), claims 1-30 stand rejected, and are hereby appealed.

C. Claims on Appeal

There are 30 claims on appeal (claims 1-30).

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

The claims hereby appealed are based on the claims as amended in the Reply to Final Office Action and Request for Continued Examination filed August 21, 2006, in response to the Final Office Action dated May 8, 2006. No amendment was offered or entered after the September 29 Office Action.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

The subject matter of claim 1 can be summarized as follows:

A system including a router is provided. The router includes a first interface to communicate with a local area network connection at an end user computer and a second interface to communicate with a wide area network connection at a distributed computer network. The router also includes detection logic responsive to the first interface. The detection logic detects user inactivity at the end-user computer. In addition the router includes blocking logic responsive to the detection logic. The blocking logic selectively initiates a blocking signal to disable communications received at the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer.

Claim 1 finds support from at least paragraphs [1018] - [1021] of the specification.

The subject matter of claim 10 can be summarized as follows:

A method is provided that includes establishing a broadband connection at routing equipment. The broadband connection includes a first local data connection between an end-user computer and the routing equipment and a second wide area network data connection between the routing equipment and an internet service provider. The method also includes detecting at the routing equipment that the end-user computer has been idle for an idle time greater than an idle time inactivity threshold and determining an inactivity event at the routing equipment. In addition, the method includes initiating a blocking signal at the routing equipment to establish a blocking condition. The blocking signal blocks data received at the routing equipment via the second wide area network data connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to the end-user computer via the first local data connection.

Claim 10 finds support from at least paragraphs [1022] – [1025] of the specification.

The subject matter of claim 19 can be summarized as follows:

A method of routing data at digital subscriber line routing equipment is provided. The method includes establishing a first portion of a digital subscriber line connection at digital subscriber line routing equipment. The first portion of the digital subscriber line connection includes a local Ethernet data connection between an end-user computer and the digital subscriber line routing equipment. The first portion of the digital subscriber line connection terminates at a first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment. The method also includes establishing a second portion of the digital subscriber line connection. The second portion of the digital subscriber line connection includes a wide area data connection between the digital subscriber line routing equipment and internet service provider equipment. The second portion of the digital subscriber line connection terminates at a second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment. In addition, the method includes detecting at the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment an indication that the end-user computer has been idle for an idle time greater than an idle time inactivity threshold. During a first period of time, the method further includes initiating a blocking signal at the digital subscriber line routing equipment. The blocking signal blocks data received from the second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment from being communicated by the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment.

Claim 19 finds support from at least paragraphs [1022] – [1025] of the specification.

The subject matter of claim 23 can be summarized as follows:

A system including a router is provided. The router includes a first interface to a local area network where the local area network includes a plurality of end-user computers. The router also includes a second interface to a wide area network connection. In addition, the router includes detection logic responsive to the first interface. The detection logic detects user inactivity at one or more of the plurality of end-user computers. Further, the router includes blocking logic responsive to the

detection logic. The blocking logic selectively initiates a blocking signal to selectively disable communications from being sent over the first interface to at least one of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network while allowing communications to be sent over the first interface to at least one other of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network.

Claim 23 finds support from at least paragraphs [1018] – [1021] of the specification.

The subject matter of claim 26 can be summarized as follows:

A method is provided that includes establishing a broadband connection at a router. The broadband connection includes a first data connection between a local area network coupled to a plurality of end-user computers and a wide area network data connection to an internet service provider. The method also includes detecting at the router that one or more of the plurality of the end-user computers in the local area network has been idle for a time greater than an inactivity threshold. In addition, the method includes initiating a blocking signal at the router. The blocking signal selectively blocks data originating from the wide area network data connection from being communicated to the one or more of the plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state.

Claim 26 finds support from at least paragraphs [1022] – [1025] of the specification.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

A. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16, 17, 19-26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,595 ("Cohen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,083 ("Shaffer").

B. Claims 5, 18, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Shaffer and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,666 ("Evans").

C. Claims 7, 15, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Shaffer and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,152 ("Gerszberg").

VII. ARGUMENT (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

Appellant respectfully appeals each of the rejections applied against all claims now pending on appeal.

A. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16, 17, 19-26, and 29 are Allowable Over Cohen in View of Shaffer

Appellant traverses the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16, 17, 19-26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over Cohen in view of Shaffer, at paragraph 3, page 4 of the September 29 Office Action.

There are five independent claims in the case. Each independent claim stands or falls independently. Arguments demonstrating the allowability of each independent claim are presented herein.

The September 29 Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, which requires:

> 1) there must be a suggestion or motivation to make the asserted combination, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art;
>
> 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and
>
> 3) the alleged combination teaches or suggests all the claim limitations.

See M.P.E.P. §2142.

Appellant submits that the asserted combination of references fails to disclose or suggest the particular combination of elements recited in the claims. Further, Appellant submits that there is no suggestion or motivation to make the asserted combination of references either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Independent Claim 1

Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the September 29 Office Action acknowledges that Cohen does not disclose or suggest a router that includes blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications received from an interface to a wide area network from being sent to an end-user computer over an interface to a local area network, as recited in Claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Cohen discloses a customer premise digital subscriber line (CP DSL) modem that may issue a local standby command to a central office (CO) modem in a DSL multiplexer when there is no activity at the CP DSL modem Ethernet port. The DSL multiplexer will release the inactive CP DSL modem to a free modem pool. (*See* Cohen, col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 3; FIG. 2B). Cohen does not disclose determining inactivity of an end-user computer at routing equipment (i.e., though a modem is not receiving data from a computer, the computer is not necessarily inactive), as recited in claim 1. Additionally, Cohen does not disclose blocking logic that selectively initiates a blocking signal to disable communications received at one interface *of the router* from being *sent to* an end-user computer via another interface of the router, as recited in claim 1.

Shaffer does not disclose the features of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Cohen. In contrast to claim 1, Shaffer discloses a computing device including a screen saver program that is "configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, so that the screen saver switches the computing device to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the pre-selected period." (*See* Shaffer, col. 5. lines 21-25). "The locked mode inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, lines 29-31). Thus, Shaffer discloses a screen saver capability that restricts functions *at the computing device*. Shaffer does not disclose or suggest a router including blocking logic that selectively initiates a

blocking signal to disable communications received at one interface *of the router* from being *sent to* an end-user computer via another interface of the router, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner argues that the combination of Cohen and Shaffer discloses a system in which access is denied to an incoming call received via a network link when the system is in high-security mode, until a user authentication is validated. (*See* September 29 Office Action, p. 3). Appellant notes that the network link relied upon by the Examiner is a component of the computing system taught by Shaffer. (Shaffer, col. 4, ll. 41-43). Thus, even if the network link disclosed by Shaffer denies access to an incoming call, Shaffer still does not disclose a *router* that *initiates* a blocking signal to disable communications received at one interface of the router *from being sent* over another interface of the router to an end-user computer, as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6, and 8-9 depend from claim 1, which Appellant has shown to be allowable. Hence, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer also fails to disclose or suggest at least one of the elements recited in claims 2-4, 6, and 8-9, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 6, and 8-9 are also allowable.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features not disclosed by Cohen and Shaffer. For example, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose detection logic and blocking logic embedded within an auto-sensing Ethernet port of the router, as recited in claim 6. In contrast to claim 6, Cohen discloses that a customer premise digital subscriber line (DSL) modem may issue a local standby command when there is no activity detected by the customer premise modem at an Ethernet port of the customer premise modem. (*See* Cohen, col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 3). In contrast to claim 6, Shaffer does not disclose or suggest a router including an auto-sensing Ethernet port and detection logic and blocking logic embedded within the router Ethernet port, as recited in claim 6. For this additional reason, claim 6 is allowable.

Independent Claim 10

Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 10. For example, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at routing

equipment to establish a blocking condition, the blocking signal blocking data received at the routing equipment via a second wide area network data connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to an end-user computer via a first local data connection. The Examiner has indicated that claim 10 has been rejected using the same rationale as that for claim 1. (September 29 Office Action, p. 7). As explained previously, however, Cohen discloses a customer premise digital subscriber line (CP DSL) modem that may issue a local standby command to a central office (CO) modem in a DSL multiplexer when there is no activity at the CP DSL modem Ethernet port. The DSL multiplexer will release the inactive CP DSL modem to a free modem pool. (*See* Cohen, col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 3; FIG. 2B). Cohen does not disclose determining inactivity of an end-user computer at routing equipment (i.e., though a modem is not receiving data from a computer, the computer is not necessarily inactive), as recited in claim 10. Additionally, Cohen does not disclose initiating a blocking signal at the routing equipment to establish a blocking condition, where the blocking signal blocks data received at the routing equipment from being communicated from the routing equipment to the end-user computer, as recited in claim 10. Cohen discloses detecting inactivity of a *modem* and *releasing* the modem to a free modem pool, rather than blocking data communication via the modem.

Shaffer does not disclose the features of claim 10 that are not disclosed by Cohen. As stated previously, Shaffer discloses a computing device including a screen saver program that is "configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, so that the screen saver switches the computing device to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the pre-selected period." (*See* Shaffer, col. 5. lines 21-25). "The locked mode inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, lines 29-31). Thus, Shaffer discloses a screen saver capability that restricts functions *at the computing device*. Shaffer does not disclose determining an inactivity of an end-user computer at a router. Additionally, Shaffer does not disclose blocking data originating from a wide area network connection of a router from being communicated *to* a local data connection. Even if the user computer disclosed by Shaffer could be said to include both a wide area connection and a local area connection, Shaffer discloses blocking access to *memory data* via a network link, not

blocking data *from being communicated* from a wide area network connection to a local data connection. Hence, Claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11-14 and 16-17 depend from claim 10, which Appellant has shown to be allowable. Hence, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer also fails to disclose or suggest at least one of the elements recited in claims 11-14 and 16-17, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 10. Accordingly, claims 11-14 and 16-17 are also allowable.

Independent Claim 19

Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 19. For example, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest, during a first period of time, initiating a blocking signal at digital subscriber line routing equipment, the blocking signal blocking data received from a second port of digital subscriber line routing equipment from being communicated by a first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment, as recited in Claim 19. The Examiner has indicated that claim 19 has been rejected using the same rationale as that for claims 1 and 10. (September 29 Office Action, p. 9). As explained previously, however, Cohen discloses a customer premise digital subscriber line (CP DSL) modem that may issue a local standby command to a central office (CO) modem in a DSL multiplexer when there is no activity at the CP DSL modem Ethernet port. The DSL multiplexer will release the inactive CP DSL modem to a free modem pool. (*See* Cohen, col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 3; FIG. 2B). Cohen does not disclose determining inactivity of an end-user computer at routing equipment (i.e., though a modem is not receiving data from a computer, the computer is not necessarily inactive), as recited in claim 19. Additionally, Cohen does not disclose initiating a blocking signal at digital subscriber line routing equipment, the blocking signal blocking data received from a second port of digital subscriber line routing equipment from being communicated by a first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment, as recited in Claim 19. Cohen discloses detecting inactivity of a *modem* and *releasing* the modem to a free modem pool, rather than *blocking* data communication via the modem.

As stated previously, Shaffer discloses a computing device including a screen saver program that is "configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, so that the screen saver switches the computing device to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a

period exceeding the pre-selected period." (*See* Shaffer, col. 5. lines 21-25). "The locked mode inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, lines 29-31). Thus, Shaffer discloses a screen saver capability that restricts functions *at the computing device*. Shaffer does not disclose determining an inactivity of an end-user computer at a router. Additionally, Shaffer does not disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at digital subscriber line routing equipment, where the blocking signal blocks data received from one port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment from being communicated by another port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment, as recited in claim 19. Hence, Claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 19, which Appellant has shown to be allowable. Hence, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer also fails to disclose or suggest at least one of the elements recited in claims 20-22, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 19. Thus, claims 20-22 are also allowable.

Independent Claims 23 and 26

Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combinations of claim 23 or claim 26. For example, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest, a router that includes blocking logic responsive to the detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to selectively disable communications from being sent over the first interface to at least one of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network while allowing communications to be sent over the first interface to at least one other of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network, as recited in claim 23. The Examiner has indicated that claims 23 and 26 have been rejected using the same rationale as that for claims 1 and 10. (September 29 Office Action, p. 9). As explained previously, however, Cohen discloses a customer premise digital subscriber line (CP DSL) modem that may issue a local standby command to a central office (CO) modem in a DSL multiplexer when there is no activity at the CP DSL modem Ethernet port. The DSL multiplexer will release the inactive CP DSL modem to a free modem pool. (*See* Cohen, col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 3; FIG. 2B). Cohen does not disclose a router that includes blocking logic responsive to the detection logic, the blocking logic

to selectively initiate a blocking signal to selectively disable communications from being sent over the first interface to at least one of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network while allowing communications to be sent over the first interface to at least one other of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network, as recited in claim 23. Rather, Cohen teaches away from this element of claim 23, by disclosing a modem that is placed into standby mode, as a result of inactivity at the modem.

As stated previously, Shaffer discloses a computing device including a screen saver program that is "configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, so that the screen saver switches the computing device to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the pre-selected period." (*See* Shaffer, col. 5. lines 21-25). "The locked mode inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, lines 29-31). Thus, Shaffer discloses a screen saver capability that restricts functions *at the computing device*. Shaffer does not disclose or suggest a router that includes blocking logic responsive to the detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to selectively disable communications from being sent over the first interface to at least one of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network while allowing communications to be sent over the first interface to at least one other of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network, as recited in claim 23. Hence, claim 23 is allowable.

Additionally, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest selectively blocking data originating from a wide area network data connection from being communicated to one or more of a plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state, as recited in Claim 26. Additionally, Cohen teaches away from this element of claim 26, by disclosing a modem that is placed into standby mode, as a result of inactivity at the modem. Hence, claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 24-25 depend from Claim 23. Claim 29 depends from Claim 26. Hence, claims 24-25 and 29 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 23 and 26.

Further, the dependent claims include additional features not disclosed by Cohen and Shaffer. For example, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose detection logic and blocking logic that are embedded within an auto-sensing Ethernet port, as recited in claim 25. In contrast to claim 25, Cohen discloses that a customer premise digital subscriber line (DSL) modem may issue a local standby command when there is no activity detected by the customer premise modem at an Ethernet port of the customer premise modem. (*See* Cohen, col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 3). In contrast to claim 25, Shaffer does not disclose or suggest a router including an auto-sensing Ethernet port and detection logic and blocking logic embedded within the router Ethernet port, as recited in claim 25. For this additional reason, claim 25 is allowable.

B. Claims 5, 18, and 27-28 are Allowable Over Cohen in View of Shaffer and in View of Evans

Appellant traverses the rejection of claims 5, 18, and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Cohen in view of Shaffer in view of Evans, at paragraph 4, page 12 of the September 29 Office Action.

Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. As explained previously, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer does not disclose or suggest each of the elements recited in claim 1. For example, Cohen and Shaffer do not disclose or suggest a router including blocking logic responsive to detection logic where the blocking logic selectively initiates a blocking signal to disable communications received at a second interface from being sent over a first interface to an end-user computer, as recited in claim 1. Evans does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Cohen and Shaffer.

In contrast to claim 1, Evans discloses an operating system that allows multiple users to be logged in at the same time using a common logon screen, where each user is associated with their own desktop and each user's data is separated from the data of other users. (*See* Evans, col. 3, lines 54-57 and col. 4, lines 23-35). Evans also discloses that after a user configurable period of inactivity, the operating system will switch the display to the logon screen. (*See* Evans, col. 5, lines 29-34). Evans, however, does not disclose or suggest a router including blocking logic responsive to detection logic, where the

blocking logic selectively initiates a blocking signal to disable communications received at a second interface from being sent over a first interface to an end-user computer, as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 5 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Claim 18

Claim 18 depends from claim 10. As explained previously, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer does not disclose or suggest each of the elements recited in claim 10. For example, Cohen and Shaffer do not disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at routing equipment to establish a blocking condition, where the blocking signal blocks data received at the routing equipment via one data network connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to an end-user computer via another network connection, as recited in claim 10. Evans does not teach or suggest the features of claim 10 that are not disclosed by Cohen and Shaffer.

In contrast to claim 10, Evans discloses an operating system that allows multiple users to be logged in at the same time using a common logon screen, where each user is associated with their own desktop and each user's data is separated from the data of other users. (*See* Evans, col. 3, lines 54-57 and col. 4, lines 23-35). Evans also discloses that after a user configurable period of inactivity, the operating system will switch the display to the logon screen. (*See* Evans, col. 5, lines 29-34). Evans, however, does not disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at routing equipment, where the blocking signal blocks data received at the routing equipment via one data connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to an end-user computer via another data connection, as recited in claim 10. Thus, claim 18 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 10.

Claims 27 and 28

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26. As discussed above, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer does not disclose or suggest each of the elements recited in claim 26. For example, Cohen and Shaffer do not disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at

a router, where the blocking signal selectively blocks data originating from a wide area network data connection from being communicated to the one or more of a plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state, as recited in claim 26. Evans does not teach or suggest the features of claim 26 that are not disclosed by Cohen and Shaffer.

In contrast to claim 26, Evans discloses an operating system that allows multiple users to be logged in at the same time using a common logon screen, where each user is associated with their own desktop and each user's data is separated from the data of other users. (*See* Evans, col. 3, lines 54-57 and col. 4, lines 23-35). Evans also discloses that after a user configurable period of inactivity, the operating system will switch the display to the logon screen. (*See* Evans, col. 5, lines 29-34). Evans, however, does not disclose initiating a blocking signal at a router, where the blocking signal selectively blocks data originating from a wide area network data connection from being communicated to the one or more of the plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state, as recited in claim 26. Thus, claims 27-28 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 26.

C. Claims 7, 15, and 30 are Allowable Over Cohen in View of Shaffer and in View of Gerszberg

Appellant traverses the rejection of claims 7, 15, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over Cohen in view of Shaffer and in view of Gerszberg, at paragraph 5, page 13 of the September 29 Office Action.

Claims 7, 15, and 30 depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 26, respectively. As discussed above, the combination of Cohen and Shaffer does not disclose or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 1, 10, and 26. For example, Cohen and Shaffer do not disclose or suggest a router including blocking logic responsive to detection logic where the blocking logic selectively initiates a blocking signal to disable communications

received at a second interface from being sent over a first interface to an end-user computer, as recited in claim 1. Cohen and Shaffer also do not disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at the routing equipment to establish a blocking condition where the blocking signal blocks data received at the routing equipment via a second wide area network data connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to an end-user computer via a first local data connection, as recited in claim 10. Further, Cohen and Shaffer do not disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at a router, where the blocking signal selectively blocks data originating from the wide area network data connection from being communicated to the one or more of the plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state, as recited in claim 26.

Gerszberg does not teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 10, and 26 that are not disclosed by Cohen and Shaffer. In contrast to claims 1, 10, and 26, Gerszberg discloses an integrated residence gateway and set-top box device that provide communications services to customers via a coaxial cable, a twisted pair, or both. (*See* Gerszberg, Abstract). Gerszberg, however, does not disclose or suggest a router or routing equipment that initiates a blocking signal, as recited in claims 1, 10, and 26. Thus, claims 7, 15, and 30 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from their respective independent claims, claims 1, 10, and 26.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims of the present application are allowable. In view of the arguments presented above, Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

The text of each claim involved in the appeal is as follows:

1. (Previously Presented) A system comprising:

a router, including:

a first interface to communicate with a local area network connection at an end user computer;

a second interface to communicate with a wide area network connection at a distributed computer network;

detection logic responsive to the first interface, the detection logic to detect user inactivity at the end-user computer; and

blocking logic responsive to the detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications received at the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer.

2. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein the blocking logic sends the blocking signal in response to the detecting logic detecting the user inactivity for a selected period of time.

3. (Original) The system of claim 2, wherein the selected period of time is between one and ten minutes.

4. (Original) The system of claim 2, wherein the selected period of time is a fixed time period.

5. (Original) The system of claim 2, wherein the selected period of time is determined by a user of the end-user computer.

6. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1, wherein the detection logic and the blocking logic are embedded within an auto-sensing Ethernet port of the router.

7. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein the wide area network is a digital subscriber line connection that carries authenticated point to point protocol over Ethernet session traffic.

8. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein the distributed computer network is the Internet.

9. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein the second interface is coupled to an internet service provider.

10. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:

establishing a broadband connection at routing equipment, the broadband connection including a first local data connection between an end-user computer and the routing equipment and a second wide area network data connection between the routing equipment and an internet service provider;

detecting at the routing equipment that the end-user computer has been idle for an idle time greater than an idle time inactivity threshold and determining an inactivity event at the routing equipment; and

initiating a blocking signal at the routing equipment to establish a blocking condition, the blocking signal blocking data received at the routing equipment via the second wide area network data connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to the end-user computer via the first local data connection.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, further comprising detecting activity from the end-user computer at the routing equipment.

12. (Original) The method of claim 11, further comprising removing the blocking condition to allow communications from the second wide area data connection to be sent to the first local data connection.

13. (Original) The method of claim 12, further comprising allowing data communications from the first local data connection to be communicated to the second wide area data connection.

14. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the first local data connection is an Ethernet connection.

15. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the second wide area data connection is a point to point over Ethernet session.

16. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the idle time inactivity threshold is a fixed threshold defining a fixed amount of idle time.

17. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the idle time activity threshold is a programmable threshold.

18. (Original) The method of claim 17, further comprising receiving user defined idle time information and modifying the idle time inactivity threshold based on the user defined idle time information.

19. (Previously Presented) A method of routing data at digital subscriber line routing equipment, the method comprising:

establishing a first portion of a digital subscriber line connection at digital subscriber line routing equipment, the first portion of the digital subscriber line connection including a local Ethernet data connection between an end-user computer and the digital subscriber line routing equipment, the first portion of the digital subscriber line connection terminating at a first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment;

establishing a second portion of the digital subscriber line connection, the second portion of the digital subscriber line connection including a wide area data connection between the digital subscriber line routing equipment and internet service provider equipment, the second portion of the digital subscriber line

connection terminating at a second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment;

detecting at the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment an indication that the end-user computer has been idle for an idle time greater than an idle time inactivity threshold; and

during a first period of time, initiating a blocking signal at the digital subscriber line routing equipment, the blocking signal blocking data received from the second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment from being communicated by the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment.

20. (Original) The method of claim 19, further comprising, during a second period of time after the first period of time, detecting activity at the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment indicating activity at the end-user computer and communicating data received at the second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment to the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment and to the end-user computer.

21. (Original) The method of claim 20, wherein the idle time inactivity threshold is a fixed threshold defining a fixed amount of idle time.

22. (Original) The method of claim 20, wherein the idle time inactivity threshold is a programmable threshold.

23. (Previously Presented) A system, comprising:

a router, including:

a first interface to a local area network, said local area network comprising a plurality of end-user computers;

a second interface to a wide area network connection;

detection logic responsive to the first interface, the detection logic to detect user inactivity at one or more of the plurality of end-user computers; and

blocking logic responsive to the detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to selectively disable communications from being sent over the first interface to at least one of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network while allowing communications to be sent over the first interface to at least one other of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network.

24. (Previously presented) The system of claim 23, wherein the user inactivity is detected after a selected period of time.

25. (Previously presented) The system of claim 23, wherein the detection logic and the blocking logic is embedded within an auto-sensing Ethernet port.

26. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:

establishing a broadband connection at a router, the broadband connection including a first data connection between a local area network coupled to a plurality of end-user computers and a wide area network data connection to an internet service provider;

detecting at the router that one or more of the plurality of the end-user computers in the local area network has been idle for a time greater than an inactivity threshold; and

initiating a blocking signal at the router, the blocking signal selectively blocking data originating from the wide area network data connection from being communicated to the one or more of the plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state.

27. (Previously presented) The method of claim 26, further comprising detecting resumed activity from at least one of the one or more of the plurality of end-user computers previously in an inactive state.

28. (Previously presented) The method of claim 27, further comprising allowing communications from the wide area network data connection to be sent to the at least one of the one or more of the plurality of end-user computers previously in an inactive state.

29. (Previously presented) The method of claim 26, wherein the first data connection is an Ethernet connection.

30. (Previously presented) The method of claim 26, wherein the wide area network data connection is a point to point over Ethernet session.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 12 2007

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

(N/A)

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

(N/A)

XI. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, all pending claims are allowable and a notice of allowance is courteously solicited. Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned attorney at the address indicated. Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims and that this patent application is passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

2-12-2007
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler; Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Appellant(s)
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)